

REMARKS

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on February 14, 2003. Claims 2-10 and 12-18 are pending for examination. The Examiner has rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 112 due to informalities. Claims 10 and 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rogers et al. (U.S. 5,946,386), hereinafter Rogers. Claims 2-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers in view of Andrews et al. (U.S. 5,848,143), hereinafter Andrews.

Applicant has again carefully studied the reference of Rogers, and has thoroughly reviewed the newly added reference of Andrews, and the Examiner's rejections and statements in the instant Office Action. In response, applicant herein amends the claims and specification to more particularly point out, disclose and distinctly claim the subject matter of applicant's invention regarded as patentable. Applicant further provides facts and arguments that the claims and specification as amended clearly distinguish over the prior art presented by the Examiner. Applicant points out and argues the key limitations in the base claims that the Examiner appears to have misunderstood in his rejections and statements.

Regarding the Examiner's 112 rejection of claim 5, the Examiner states that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the recited limitation "the call center". In response, applicant herein amends the language of claim 5 deleting the phrase "call center", and replacing with the phrase "customer premises", as recited in the base claim.

Regarding the Examiner's merit rejections of applicant's claims, applicant herein amends the language of the base claims to specifically recite a method for routing received IPNT calls, and for individual customization of routing rules for the received calls, and a call router system for determining routing of incoming

IPNT calls, in a customer premises IPNT call center, wherein the received IPNT calls are routed to the IPNT-capable workstation without converting protocol of the received IPNT call. Applicant further amends the specification to include specific and related disclosure as recited in applicant's claims, and shown in applicant's drawing figures in the specification.

Regarding claims 10 and 13, the Examiner states that, as to claim 10, Rogers teaches in a customer premises IPNT organization having all of the architectural elements of applicant's claim, a method for individual customization of routing rules for the received calls comprising all of the steps of applicant's claim, including routing the received telephone calls by the router according to the transmitted routing determination (col. 36, lines 33-45 and col. 37, lines 1-51). The Examiner further states that, as to claim 13, with respect to Figures 1 and 5, Rogers teaches a call router system for determining routing of incoming IPNT calls, having all of the architectural elements of applicant's claim, wherein the client user interface is adapted to transmit user-edited routing rules to the router, and the router is adapted to provide routing to incoming calls addressed to the user according to the current routing rules (col. 36, lines 33-45 and col. 37, lines 1-51).

Regarding claim 2, the Examiner states that, with respect to Figures 1 and 5, Rogers teaches a method for routing IPNT calls at customer premises having all of the architectural elements of applicant's claim, comprising all of the steps of applicant's claim including routing the call to the IPNT-capable workstation associated with the intended recipient according to the current routing rules specific to the intended recipient (col. 36, lines 33-45 and col. 37, lines 1-51), with the exception that Rogers does not teach "a computer digitally connected to a telephone". The Examiner further states that it is obvious, however, that Rogers suggests the limitation because Rogers teaches routing voice-over-Internet calls to any telephone instrument and TAPI client (col. 9, lines 47-52 and col. 35, lines 18-22). The Examiner relies on Andrews for teaching the limitation (Figure 11),

stating that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the digital connection capability of Andrews to the invention of Rogers in order to provide other applications for placing or receiving calls.

In the Response to Arguments section on page 7 of the instant Office Action, the Examiner kindly responds to applicant's previous argument that the IPNT calls of applicant's invention do not use PSTN facilities, as shown in applicant's Figure 7. The Examiner disagrees for the same reasons given in section 5 of the Office Action dated 10/25/02, and in addition, states that applicant's disclosed teachings with respect to Figure 7 did not teach routing of Internet calls over data link 1119, and if there is such a teaching in the disclosure, the Examiner requests that applicant point out to the Examiner the respective passages.

The Examiner is correct in his statement that applicant's specification in the Descriptions portion does not specifically teach routing of IPNT calls over data link 1119 of Figure 7. However, Applicant respectfully points out to the Examiner that, according to the Four Corners Rule, the language of applicant's originally-filed claims is itself disclosure supporting receiving and routing of IPNT calls. All of the architectural elements recited in applicant's claims are shown in applicant's Figure 7, and an IPNT port for receiving the IPNT calls to the managing processor and routing the IPNT calls to the IPNT-capable computer stations is therefore implied, but not specifically shown in the illustration. The Four Corners Rule specifies that all subject matter in the claims, drawings and specification singularly may be counted as disclosure. Applicant therefore adds the claim language supporting receiving and routing IPNT calls to the specification, as outlined above, to overcome any rejection of applicant's claims based on that premise.

Applicant argues further that applicant's claims as amended, which now specifically recite routing the received IPNT calls to the IPNT-capable computer workstations, without converting the protocol of the call, now clearly and unarguably distinguish applicant's invention over the prior art references. The teachings of Rogers is very clearly directed to the use of existing conventional POTS telephone equipment, and converting any and all incoming calls being of a protocol other than PSTN, into a PSTN call prior to routing to the final destination. The Examiner states that, as to claim 2, Rogers teaches a method for routing IPNT calls at customer premises comprising all of the steps of applicant's claim including routing the call to the IPNT-capable workstation associated with the intended recipient, with the exception that Rogers does not teach "a computer digitally connected to a telephone", relying on Andrews for teaching the limitation. The Examiner further states that it is obvious, however, that Rogers suggests the limitation because Rogers teaches routing voice-over-Internet calls to any telephone instrument and TAPI client (col. 9, lines 47-52 and col. 35, lines 18-22).

Applicant respectfully points out to the Examiner, however, that although Rogers may teach or suggest receiving and routing an IPNT call, in all cases, the received call must be converted to PSTN before being routed and received at the final destination, which is standard POTS telephone equipment not capable of handling incoming calls of a protocol other than PSTN. Figure 1 of Rogers clearly illustrates that in-house system user 113 receives an incoming routed call, regardless of the protocol at the call origination point, using a standard telephone instrument 106, which is not IPNT-capable, and which is not digitally connected to a computer, therefore, cannot possibly be IPNT-capable. Applicant cites a specific portion of the specification of Rogers (col. 2, line 59 to col. 3, line 4), which clearly supports applicant's position. The specific portion clearly and

specifically recites that real-time protocol conversion is provided between central office trunks and PBX trunks of the Call Management System, allowing the system to receive new or different types of services from the telephone provider while still connecting to and utilizing existing telephone systems, which cannot otherwise accept the new capabilities directly. The conversion between different trunk circuits allows the systems features and functions to be implemented without upgrade of the organization's legacy PBX or other switch or alternatively as a replacement for an existing PBX.

Applicant has very carefully and thoroughly reviewed the reference of Rogers, particularly those portions cited and applied by the Examiner in support of his rejections and statements, and applicant can nowhere find any specific teaching, suggestion or even motivation for routing received IPNT calls to the final destination without converting the protocol of the received call, as is now specifically recited in applicant's base claims, and clearly suggested in applicant's specification as amended. Applicant argues therefore that Rogers now clearly and unarguably fails as a primary reference for reading on all of the limitations of applicant's base claims, which now distinguish over the prior art of Rogers and Andrews, singly or in combination.

Applicant believes independent claims 2, 10 and 13 as amended and argued above are therefore now patentable over the combined references. Claims 3-9, 12 and 14-18 are then patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

As all of the claims standing for examination as amended have been shown to be patentable over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration after final and that the present case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions due beyond any extension requested and paid with this amendment, such extensions are hereby requested. If there are any fees due

- 12 -

beyond any fees paid with the present amendment, such fees are authorized to be deducted from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,

Igor Neyman, et al

by _____


Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Donald R. Boys
Central Coast Patent Agency
P.O. Box 187
Aromas, CA 95004
(831) 726-1457